

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 20, 24, 26 and 27, cancels claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 18, 22, 23, 25, 29 and 30, and adds claims 31-42. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19-21, 24, 26-28 and 31-42 will be pending in the application.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,737,701 to Rosenthal et al. ("Rosenthal"). By this amendment, applicants cancel claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 18, 22, 23, 25, 29 and 30, rendering the rejections of those claims moot. For reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as to all remaining claims.

Amended Independent Claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 Patentably Define Over Rosenthal

Independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 have been amended to require, in various forms:

- Allowing access to resources in a list associated with a subscriber;
- Allowing access to resources in an "always allow" list associated with a plurality of subscribers; and
- Requiring entry of a PIN if a requested resource is not on either of the above two lists.

Rosenthal merely describes waiving an authentication code entry requirement if a caller dials a destination number that matches a look-up table maintained for that caller.

Rosenthal does not describe or suggest allowing access to resources in an "always allow" list associated with a plurality of subscribers. As taught in the present specification at, for example, page 8, one example of an "always allow" list is a list of emergency and convenient phone numbers (e.g. 911) that is maintained in a "system-wide" list.

The Office Action takes the position that Rosenthal's "calling card" authorization process corresponds to the "always allow" feature of the claims. However, Rosenthal merely suggests

that when a caller dials "0", the call is routed to an operator services system 104, which then performs similar processing as before of determining if a destination phone number is in a user's look-up table.

This can be seen clearly from Rosenthal's FIG. 4. As shown in FIG. 4, if the destination number is preceded by "0", the call is routed to an operator service and the user is requested to enter a calling card number. If no calling card number is supplied, the caller is switched to a live operator (step 406) (note, the "yes" and "no" arrows after step 404 in FIG. 4 should be reversed). After a calling card number is entered, if an authentication code was included with the number, the call is placed (step 405). Otherwise, similar processing as in FIG. 2 is performed of looking up the destination number in the user's look-up table, and requiring an authentication code if the destination number is not in the table.

Rosenthal simply does not disclose or suggest allowing a number to be called without authentication if it is on an "always allow" list. The operator service (associated with Rosenthal's "0" number) is clearly not a desired destination number, and does not correspond to a requested resource per the claims.

As shown clearly above, Rosenthal does not disclose or suggest at least:

- Allowing access to resources in an "always allow" list associated with a plurality of subscribers; and
- Requiring entry of a PIN if a requested resource is not on the "always allow" list or a list of resources associated with the subscriber.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 patentably define over Rosenthal, and the § 102 rejection of the claims, as well as all pending claims dependent thereon, should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 4, 11, 19 and 26 Patentably Define Over Rosenthal

Dependent claims 4, 11, 19 and 26 depend from claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, respectively, and patentably define over Rosenthal for at least the reasons presented above.

Dependent claims 4, 11, 19 and 26 further require denying access to a resource if it is on an "always deny" list.

The Office Action relies on col. 7, lines 23-32 of Rosenthal as disclosing the "always deny" list. However, this passage merely states that in certain wireless areas, an additional step of matching a speed dial number is performed. This passage does not disclose or suggest maintaining a list of destination numbers to which callers are always denied access. As set forth in the specification at, for example, page 8, the present invention maintains a list of numbers, for example, numbers associated with fraudulent use, to be excluded from access always. Rosenthal still permits access to any number, albeit with further comparison of speed dial information.

For at least these additional reasons, claims 4, 11, 19 and 26 patentably define over Rosenthal and the § 102 rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 5, 12, 20 and 27 Patentably Define Over Rosenthal

Dependent claims 5, 12, 20 and 27 depend from claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, respectively, and patentably define over Rosenthal for at least the reasons presented above.

Dependent claims 5, 12, 20 and 27 further requiring entry of a PIN if a resource is on an "always require PIN" list.

The Office Action relies on col. 7, lines 57-64 of Rosenthal as disclosing the "always require PIN" list. However, this passage merely states that if a calling card number is entered, the system determines whether a PIN was included in it. This passage does not disclose or suggest maintaining a list of destination numbers to which callers are always required to enter PINs. As set forth in the specification at, for example, page 8, the present invention maintains a list of numbers, for example, 900 numbers and international phone numbers, for which a PIN is always required. In the "calling card" processing, Rosenthal still permits access to a destination phone number without entry of a PIN if it is on a user's look-up table (see FIG. 4, step 409).

For at least these additional reasons, claims 5, 12, 20 and 27 patentably define over Rosenthal and the § 102 rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 31-42 have been added to more fully define the patentable features of the invention as originally described in the specification.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and Notice thereof is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain which the Examiner feels may be resolved through a telephone interview, s/he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: October 18, 2004



40,580

Reg. No.

Mark J. Danielson

(650) 233-4777

Please reply to customer no. 27,498

Pirkey et al.
09/732,333
60372850v1

10

Amendment
010942-0269227